DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 620 TM 007 529

TITLE Detailed Evaluation Report for the 1976-77 School Year for the E.O.P. Compensatory Project: "Compensatory Language Arts/Reading Program for Inner City Schools".
INSTITUTION Edmonton Public School Board (Alberta).
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 41p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Achievement Gains; *Compensatory Education Programs; Foreign Countries; *Language Arts; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Reading Achievement; *Remedial Programs
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

A primary-level compensatory language arts and reading program for nine inner city schools in Edmonton, Alberta, is described briefly. During 1976-77 the program served 146 students, mostly in their first year in the program. Half of these were recommended to be returned to regular classes for the following year. Children were selected for the program on the basis of their having normal intelligence but having a problem with language arts or reading. Differences between pretests and posttests for an extensive test battery showed significant gains even when adjusted for changes in chronological age. Classroom teachers, compensatory teachers, principals, and parents responded favorably to the program and felt it was successful. Comments are made about the usefulness of specific tests and recommendations are made for revisions of the test battery. Statistical data describing the questionnaire responses are appended. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160620

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Blowers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

DETAILED EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE 1976-77 SCHOOL YEAR FOR THE E.O.F. COMPENSATORY PROJECT:

"COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING PROGRAM FOR INNER CITY SCHOOLS"

Department of Research and Evaluation
Edmonton Public School Board

August, 1977

IM007 529

COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING PROGRAM FOR INNER CITY SCHOOLS

I. CONCLUSIONS

A. The principals, program teachers and classroom teachers all agreed that the "Compensatory Language Arts/Reading Program for Inner City Schools" is an effective and beneficial program which should continue.

B. The results of the diagnostic reading tests were analyzed with all grades combined (as was done in the 1975-76 evaluation). Compensatory students made educationally and statistically significant gains in all language arts/reading skills evaluated. In addition this year's test data for each of Grades 1, 2 and 3 were analyzed separately. Some variation in results was noted from grade to grade.

C. The observed increases in student achievement in all language arts/reading skills evaluated, appear to indicate that the project provides an effective method of alleviating the specific language arts/reading deficits of the student population served.

D. The 1976-77 Grade 1 students will start Grade 2 with a statistically and educationally significant advantage in the areas of spelling, phonics, and word attack, when compared with the 1976-77 Grade 2 students who had not been in the program before. Grade 2 students who have been in the program for both Grades 1 and 2, have achieved a level better than or equal to their age standard in the areas of word attack, oral and listening comprehension, receptive vocabulary, and visual memory for objects. The only areas where they have not yet caught up to their age standard were spelling, and auditory memory.[1]

E. There was statistically significant improvement in the quantity of the childrens' oral language (when asked to describe an object or tell a story) from the beginning to the end of the school year.

F. Largely as a result of the cooperation between the compensatory and classroom teachers, the compensatory project has helped to increase awareness of the nature and extent of the difficulties being encountered by disadvantaged learners in language arts/reading and to extend the type and variety of materials being used to improve learning in this area. This in turn has had a beneficial effect on the language arts/reading achievement of the program students.

G. Many classroom teachers have reported a considerable positive influence upon their effectiveness in the classroom as a result of having more time to devote to students remaining in the classroom, after sharing the responsibility to teach language arts/reading to students requiring a great deal of individualization and reinforcement.

H. A large majority of parents indicated that the program had improved their child's ability to read and to express his/her thoughts. Most parents also said that their child enjoyed reading and school, and that they would like their child to continue in the program if the teacher thought it was best.

---

[1] Phonics tests were scored in percentages, and, therefore, the comparison of level of achievement with age standard could not be made for this area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	CONCLUSIONS	1
II.	IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION	2
III.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKROUND	2
IV.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	3
V.	SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION	4
	A. Characteristics of Students Enrolled in the Compensatory Program	4
	B. Results of Diagnostic Tests	5
	C. Oral Language Analysis	6
	D. Objectives of the Program	6
	E. Selection Criteria	7
	F. Scheduling of the Program	7
	G. Methods and Materials	7
	H. Project Personnel	7
	I. Integration of the CLAR Program in the Schools	8
	J. Other Results	8
	K. Continuation of the Program	9
	L. Results of Parent Questionnaire	9
	M. Requested Project Changes	9
VI.	TABLES	
	Diagnostic Tests	13
	Principal Questionnaire	19
	Compensatory Teacher Questionnaire	23
	Classroom Teacher Questionnaire	32
	Parent Questionnaire	35

II. IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

Because of the initial achievement deficits and the significant improvements which were experienced, continued emphasis should be placed on early intervention and remediation of language arts and reading deficits.

III. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In July, 1974, the Edmonton Public School Board received funding from the Compensatory Education component of the Educational Opportunities Fund of Alberta Education to begin the "Compensatory Language Arts/Reading Program for Inner City Schools" (CLARP). The project was initially funded for two years, and subsequently was funded for a further four years. An evaluation of the program was to be done annually.

The "Compensatory Language Arts/Reading Program for Inner City Schools" was established to provide assistance for students enrolled in Grades 1 and 2 in inner city schools who perform seriously below age-grade standards on language arts/reading readiness or achievement tests, despite the fact that they are endowed with average or better than average intellectual ability. By providing an early preventive-developmental language arts/reading program for students whose difficulties are sufficiently severe to make normal academic progress and success unlikely, the CLAR program is designed to overcome these serious disabilities. The CLAR program provides highly individualized and structured language arts/reading instruction implemented in small, supportive instructional settings.

Prior to the implementation of the project, the project staff was selected and the appropriate materials and equipment were ordered by the project team. The project team held a series of preliminary and regular monthly meetings in association with the program teachers, as well as several individual consultations with each teacher during the course of the year in order to acquaint them with the methods and materials to be utilized during the implementation of the project.

Briefing sessions with school principals and a series of meetings with regular classroom teachers were held which were designed to familiarize them with the aims, objectives, methodologies, and materials related to the project.

The implementation of the Project program involved:

A. The use of pretests to select and screen students to ensure that concentrated assistance would be most profitably used.

B. The use of pretest profiles to prepare individualized student programs and the organization of the necessary materials.

C. The implementation of individualized language arts/reading programs for 70 minutes per day (30 minutes on oral language and 40 minutes on reading) in groups of seven (7) students.

D. The integration of the project and school language arts/reading programs.

E. The posttesting, evaluation, and revision of the program.

F. Contact and consultation with parents of students enrolled in the Compensatory project by program teachers.

The specific objectives of the program are:

A. To facilitate growth and development in language arts/reading skills at the rate and in the manner appropriate for each student.

B. To provide participating students with successful experiences in the development of language arts/reading skills in order to foster positive attitudes toward, and efficient work habits in, language arts/reading areas.

C. To increase the mean language arts/reading achievement scores of pupils selected for special treatment up to a level commensurate with their abilities.

D. To establish ongoing cooperation between the program and classroom teachers in order to facilitate an exchange of materials and methodologies, not only to reinforce the skills acquired by the program students, but also to help non-project students with similar problems.

E. To encourage parents to become acquainted with the program and to secure their active support for the objectives of the project.

IV. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Standardized reading and language arts achievement and ability tests were administered by program teachers to 129 students in the Compensatory program. The tests included the Peabody, Neale A, Neale B, Betts, Botel, Detroit, Schonell A, and Roswell-Chall. Pretests were administered in September - October 1976 and posttesting took place during April - May 1977.

The Peabody, Neale A, Neale B, Schonell A and Detroit tests were scored in mental age. The difference scores (from pre to posttest) were adjusted for the change in the students' chronological age from pre to posttesting. Since only percentage scores were available for the Botel and Roswell-Chall tests, and no norms for the different age levels were available, it was not possible to adjust for age change in the analysis of these particular test results. The Betts Sight Vocabulary Test was scored according to reader level and once again it was not possible to adjust for age change when considering these test results.

Questionnaires were sent out to principals, program teachers, regular classroom teachers and parents at the end of the school year. These questionnaires examined each group's perceptions of various aspects of the project and requested suggestions for improving the operation of the program. Parents were also asked to comment on the effect of the program on their child. Seven of the nine principals responded to the questionnaire. Nine of the ten questionnaires sent to compensatory teachers were returned and 23 out of 26 classroom teachers replied. Fifty-six out of 129 parents responded to the questionnaire sent out to them.

Pre and posttest samples of oral language were obtained by compensatory teachers for 17 children enrolled in the program. Pretesting took place in October - November 1976, and posttesting took place in June 1977. The children were asked to describe two objects, a button and a twig. They were also asked to tell a story about a picture. The final sample consisted of six children in Grade 1, nine in Grade 2, and two in Grade 3.

The oral language samples were analyzed along four dimensions[1]: quantity of oral language, the complexity of the language, the number of attributes mentioned in the child's description of the button and the twig, and the quality of the story. Whether or not a title was given for the story was recorded as well.

The quantity of oral language was assessed in terms of the numbers of words, the number of C-units, the number of mazes and the number of partials used by the child in describing the objects or telling a story. A C-unit is defined as "The gramatically independent clause with any of its modifers". Compound sentences were counted as two or more C-units. Mazes were "any part of a phonological unit not syntactically or meaningfully pertinent". All the remaining phrases or words were called partials.

The complexity of oral language was measured by the average length, i.e., the number of words, per C-unit.

The descriptions of the button and twig were analyzed in terms of the number of attributes mentioned by the children. These attributes included texture, parts, color, origin, creative or common uses, shape, size, smell, weight, taste, and sentiments (of the child toward the object).

The quality of the stories was rated on a continuum from one to four. A score of one was given for a story involving only simple identification of the elements in the picture, a score of two was given for a story in which separate elements were described with no relations made, a score of three was given for a story in which some elements were related, and a score of four was given for a story in which a few relations were selected to form a story.

V. SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

A. Characteristics of Students Enrolled in the Compensatory Program

1. Enrolment

A total of 146 students were enrolled in the program in the 1976-77 school year.

2. Age (at Pre and Posttest)

The mean ages of sample students at pre and posttesting are given in Table I.

3. Year in the Compensatory Program

Most (89%) of the Grade 1 students were in their first year in the Compensatory program. About half of the Grade 2 students were in their first year of the program and half were in their second year. Half of the small number of Grade 3 students were in their third year in the program, and the other half were fairly evenly split between first and second year (slightly more were in their second year).

---

[1] The basic format and definitions used in the analyses were taken from Elements, Translating Theory Into Practice, Volume V, Feb. 1974. "A Scheme for Assessing the Nature of a Young Child's Language Competence" by P. McFetridge.

4. Number of Months in Program This Year

The mean number of months in the program this year was 7.4 months for Grade 1 students, 8.2 months for Grade 2 students, and 6.8 months for Grade 3 students.

5. Sex

The majority of students (60% or more) at all grade levels were male.

6. Attendance

Program teachers were asked to indicate whether or not each student's attendance was satisfactory. The great majority of students (87-89%) at all Grade levels were considered to have satisfactory attendance.

7. Recommendations of Compensatory Teachers

For the majority of Grade 1 students (64%) their compensatory teacher recommended that they remain in the program next year. For the Grade 2 and 3 students, however, the teachers felt that the majority should return to a regular classroom (77 and 80%). Teachers recommended that a small percentage of students be placed in a special class.

B. Results of Diagnostic Tests

1. The results of the diagnostic reading tests were analyzed with all grades combined.[1] Compensatory students made educationally and statistically significant gains in all language arts/reading skills evaluated.

2. When test data for each of Grades 1, 2 and 3 were analyzed separately, students at each grade level made statistically significant gains on the following tests: Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation; Schonell Spelling; Botel Phonics; and Roswell Chall Phonics.

3. Grade 1 students also made statistically significant gains on the Neale B - Listening Comprehension, Detroit - Auditory Memory for Words, and Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects tests.

4. Grade 2 students made statistically significant gains on the Peabody - Receptive Vocabulary, Neale A - Oral Comprehension, Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects, and Neale A - Word Attack in Context tests.

5. Gains made on the Neale A - Oral Comprehension, and Detroit - Auditory Memory for Syllables tests were statistically significant for the Grade 3 students in the Compensatory Program.

6. All grade levels improved two reader levels from pre to posttest on the Betts Sight Vocabulary Test.

7. The level of achievement of Grade 1 students[2] at the end of the 1976-77 school year was significantly higher than that of Grade 2 students at

---

[1]For those tests which were scored in mental age, difference scores were adjusted for age change from pre to posttest.

[2]The groups of Grade 1 and Grade 2 students compared were all in their first year in the Compensatory program

the beginning of the same school year for the following diagnostic tests:

Roswell-Chall - Phonics
Botel - Phonics
Schonell Spelling
Neale A - Word Attack in Context
Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation

8. Grade 2 students who have been in the program thoughout Grades 1 and 2, have achieved a level equal to their age standard in oral comprehension and word attack. Their scores on the tests of receptive vocabulary, listening comprehension and visual memory for objects were significantly better than their age standard. They had not achieved a level equal to their age standard, however, in spelling and auditory memory for words and syllables.[1]

C. Oral Language Analysis

1. In the childrens' description of the button there was a statistically significant increase in the number of words and a significant decrease in the number of mazes from pre to posttest.

2. A statistically significant increase in the number of words, C-units and partials was found from pre to posttest for the description of the twig.

3. There was a statistically significant increase in the number of words and C-units from pre to posttest for the childrens' story about the picture.

4. There was no significant increase in the number of attributes mentioned by the children from pre to posttest for their description of the button. There was a significant increase, however, for their description of the twig.

5. No significant increase was found in the ratings of the quality of the children's stories from pre to posttest.

6. Seven of the 17 children tested did not give a title to their story at either pre or posttesting. Seven children gave a title at both pre and posttesting and the remaining three children did not give a title at pretesting but did at posttesting.

D. Objectives of the Program

The majority of principals and compensatory teachers thought that the main objective of the program was to up-grade the language arts and reading skills of students who are not achieving at a level comparable with their ability.

---

[1]It was not possible to make these comparisons in the area of phonics because the tests (Roswell-Chall and Botel) were scored in percentages, and no age standards were available.

E. Selection Criteria

Children were selected for the program on the basis of the following criteria:

1. that the child was of average ability (I.Q.); and

2. that the child had a problem with language arts/reading (based on specific test results and classroom teacher recommendation.

F. Scheduling of the Program

1. The majority of the program teachers would like to see a daily addition of approximately 40 minutes to the program. Principals, however, indicated that 70 minutes was sufficient. Three of the principals said that they could schedule more time for the program, if necessary.

2. Both principals and teachers in the program agreed that the maximum class size that would be effective was between six and seven students per teacher.

G. Methods and Materials

1. All of the program teachers indicated that they used the results of pre-testing to some extent to set objectives and devise individualized programs for students. They centered the program on the student's weak areas and based it on his/her own rate of learning.

2. For Grade 1 students, the Compensatory teachers found the results of the Roswell-Chall to be the most helpful in preparing individualized programs for their students. The Detroit tests for auditory and visual memory, the Neale B, and the Metropolitan Readiness Test were also seen as being somewhat useful. The WISC was not considered useful in preparing student programs for Grade 1.

   For Grade 2 students, teachers indicated that the Roswell-Chall, Betts, and Botel tests were very helpful in designing student programs. The Detroit tests, the Neale A, Schonell A (Spelling and Word Attack), and Neale B were also seen as quite useful. The WISC and EPSB Math tests were considered of very little use in helping to devise programs for Grade 2.

H. Project Personnel

1. Four of the seven principals thought that the program teachers needed special skills. Most program teachers said that the special skills required were the same as were needed in the regular classroom setting.

2. Compensatory teachers had an average of approximately four years experience in inner-city schools. The majority had university courses in reading curriculum and instruction, one half had courses in language curriculum and instruction, and one third had courses in special education.

3. Four of the seven principals indicated that their work load had increased as a result of the program. Teachers spent an average of 7.8 hours per week preparing for the Compensatory classes.

4. Most teachers attended all of the inservice sessions and found them beneficial, particularly in giving them new ideas for the program. The majority were also happy with the way the program was presented to them, and thought that it should be neither more nor less structured than at present.

5. The exchange of information and ideas which occurred from cooperation among compensatory teachers was considered quite useful.

I. Integration of the CLAR Program in the Schools

1. Classroom teachers, compensatory teachers and principals all agreed that the communication between compensatory and classroom teachers was beneficial, particularly for discussing students needs and progress, and for sharing ideas and materials.

2. Both formal and informal meetings were held between classroom and compensatory teachers. Most of compensatory teachers used sub-time for formal meetings and found these meetings very useful. Informal meetings were seen as the most useful by the program teachers. All but one classroom teacher felt that the time for communication with the program teachers was adequate. Compensatory teachers indicated that the time was "just adequate".

3. Principals, classroom and compensatory teachers all agreed that the methods and materials of the program had influenced the classroom teachers to some extent.

4. Principals, classroom and compensatory teachers also agreed that the program presented advantages to the classroom teachers. The advantages most often mentioned were that since the regular class size was reduced, the classroom teachers could give the remaining children more individual attention, and that they were made aware of new ideas, methods, and materials.

J. Other Results

1. All the classroom teachers observed improvement in the students' achievement in their subject areas and most thought that this was due to the effect of the Compensatory program.

2. Most of the compensatory teachers thought that the program curriculum is different from the regular classroom curriculum and is better able to meet the needs of students who have low language arts/reading skills. They also indicated that more language arts time and smaller classes would be needed if the regular program was to meet these students' needs.

3. Most of the compensatory teachers have made changes in their teaching method from previous years, and attribute this to more exposure to new materials and ideas.

4. All but one of the CLARP teachers thought the program was "very" successful.

5. The principals involved in the program indicated that in their opinion the time and money invested in the program were very well spent. They also indicated that the resources allocated for the program were adequate.

K. Continuation of the Program

1. All but one of the Compensatory teachers want to continue in the program next year.

2. All principals and teachers recommended that the program should continue without any major modifications.

L. Results of Parent Questionnaire

1. 9[illegible]% of the parents surveyed knew that their child was in the Compensatory program. The majority had been informed of the program by the classroom or compensatory teacher. About one half had been in contact with the program teacher by phone or letter, and about 60% had attended a parent-teacher meeting with her.

2. 95% of the parents indicated that their child reads to them at home. The majority of these said that the child reads to them at least twice a week.

3. Most parents said that their child's reading was good or very good. Only 10% thought that it was below average or poor.

4. A large majority of the parents (84%) indicated that the program had helped their child's reading very much. They also said that their child's ability to talk about his/her thoughts had improved, and most agreed that the Compensatory program had played an important role in this improvement. Some other changes noted by parents were that their children were more interested in reading, had more self confidence and had a better attitude toward learning and school.

5. 92% of the parents thought that their child enjoyed school, and 60% said that their child enjoyed reading very much.

6. The overwhelming majority of the parents wanted their child to remain in the program if the teacher thought it best.

7. Several parents (and one principal) commented that they would like to see a similar program set up for mathematics.

M. Requested Project Changes

The following changes in the existing diagnostic test battery required for the Compensatory program have been planned by the project team for the project for the 1977-78 school year. Some of the time currently required for pre and post testing students could be more profitably spent teaching in the compensatory classrooms.

In order to increase the efficiency of and to reduce the time required for testing, the project team proposed that a few of the tests be replaced with other tests or eliminated from the required test battery. The information obtained from these tests will be obtained in slightly different form from the remaining tests in the battery.

Proposed Changes at the Grade I Level Include:

1. Dropped:

Time saved 15 min. a) Schonell Word Reading Test - the information obtained from this test can also be obtained from the Botel Sight Vocabulary tests.
- The Botel is more appropriate for children in Grades I and II.

20 min. b) Botel Phonics Inventory - a very time consuming test with complex directions for some sub sections. The information obtained from it can be obtained in slightly different form from the Schonell Spelling and the Roswell-Chall.

2. Changed:

a) Betts Sight Vocabulary - The Botel Sight Vocabulary will replace the Betts Sight Vocabulary Test. The Botel is currently administered in the Resource Room program. The use of the Botel in the Compensatory program will help to facilitate coordination of the two programs. The Botel has two word lists at each of Grade II and Grade III enabling the teacher to make better instructional decisions.

b) Neale Analysis - Form B will be replaced with Form C. The content of the passages seems to be closer to the experience of our children (therefore better measure of listening comprehension).

3. Revised Test Battery Will Include:

Pre Tests

Receptive Language
- Peabody Form A - Vocabulary
- Neale Analysis Form C - Listening Comprehension

Correlates of Reading
- Detroit Test of Learning Aptitudes
  - Visual Memory
  - Auditory Memory - unrelated syllables
  - Auditory Memory - related syllables

Expressive Language (to a sample)
- description of twig
  button
- story using picture stimulus

Post Tests

Receptive Language (as above)
Correlates of Reading (as above)
Expressive Language (as above)

Reading
- Sight Vocabulary
  - Botel Sight Vocabulary

Word Attack Skills
- Roswell-Chall Test of Word Analysis Skills (whole text)

Spelling
- Schonell Spelling Test

Oral Reading and Comprehension
- Neale Analysis Form A

Proposed Changes at the Grade II Level Include:

1. Dropped

Time saved
- 15 min. a) Schonell Graded Word Reading Test (see Grade I for reasons
- 20 min. b) Botel Phonics Inventory (see Grade I for reasons)
- 20 min. c) Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitudes - does not provide useful information for selection of students at Grade II level.
  - i. many of the children are already known by compensatory and classroom teachers
  - ii. if children are of average intelligence, but low achievers, they will be taken into program.

Tests will be available to be used for diagnostic purposes at the teacher's discretion.

2. Revised Test Battery Will Include:

Pre Test and Post Tests

Receptive Language (Oral)
- Peabody Form A - Vocabulary
- Neale Analysis C - Listening Comprehension

Expressive Language (Oral) - sample
- description of twig
  button
- story using picture stimulus

Reading: Sight Vocabulary
- Botel Sight Vocabulary

Word Attack Skills
- Roswell-Chall Test of Word Analysis Skills

Spelling
- Schonell Spelling Test

Oral Reading and Comprehension
- Neale Analysis Form A

Changes in Program Location

Due to declining enrolment, two schools will be dropped from the Compensatory program in 1977-78 and replaced by two schools which have demonstrated a need for the program. The schools to be dropped are Oliver and McDougall. They will be replaced by North Edmonton and Sherwood.

VI. TABLES

TABLE 1

MEAN AGES FOR SAMPLE STUDENTS AT PRE AND POSTTESTING

Grade	Age At Pretest	Age at Posttest
1	6 years 6 months	7 years 2 months
2	7 years 4 months	8 years
3	8 years 8 months	9 years 3 months

TABLE 2

YEAR IN COMPENSATORY PROGRAM

	Grade 1 (N=62)	Grade 2 (N=57)	Grade 3 (N=10)
Year in Progra...	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
First	55 (89)	29 (51)	2 (20)
Second	7 (11)	28 (49)	3 (30)
Third			5 (50)

TABLE 3

SEX OF PROGRAM STUDENTS

	Grade 1 (N=62)	Grade 2 (N=57)	Grade 3 (N=10)
Sex	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
Female	25 (40)	20 (35)	2 (20)
Male	37 (60)	37 (65)	8 (80)

TABLE 4

ATTENDANCE

	Grade 1 (N=62)	Grade 2 (n=57)	Grade 3 (N=10)
Attendance	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
Satisfactory	54 (87)	56 (98)	9 (90)
Unsatisfactory	8 (13)	1 (2)	1 (10)

TABLE 5

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PLACEMENT FOR COMPENSATORY STUDENTS

Recommendation	Grade 1 (N=62) Number (%)	Grade 2 (N=57) Number (%)	Grade 3 (N=10) Number (%)
Back to Regular Classroom	21 (34)	44 (77)	8 (80)
Continue in Compensatory	40 (64)	6 (10)	-
Special Class Placement	1 (2)	7 (12)	2 (20)

TABLE 6

QUANTITY AND COMPLEXITY OF ORAL LANGUAGE

	Description of Button			Description of Twig			Story		
	Pre	Post	Difference	Pre	Post	Difference	Pre	Post	Difference
Mean Number of Words	28.5	38.8	10.3*	28.8	44.5	15.6*	46.9	77.8	30.9*
Mean Number of C-Units	6.5	8.3	1.8	6.5	10.3	3.8*	11.6	17.3	5.7*
Mean Number of Words/C-Unit	5.3	5.6	0.3	5.2	4.8	-0.4	6.2	7.0	0.79
Mean Number of Mazes	2.8	0.9	-1.9*	1.5	2.3	.8	4.7	3.9	-.8
Mean Number of Partials	1.6	2.8	1.2	1.2	3.1	1.9*	2.9	4.0	1.1

* significant $p < .05$

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF ATTRIBUTES MENTIONED IN DESCRIPTION OF BUTTON AND TWIG

Mean Number of Attributes Mentioned	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Button	4.5	5.0	.5
Twig	3.8	5.5	1.7*

* significant $p < .05$

TABLE 8

RATINGS OF QUALITY OF STORY

	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Mean Rating[1]	2.1	2.7	.6

[1] Ratings range from one to four

TABLE 9

MEAN PRE, POST, AND ADJUSTED CHANGE[1] SCORES FOR DIAGNOSTIC READING TESTS

Tests	Grade 1				Grade 2				Grade 3			
	Pre	Post	Adjusted Change[1]	N	Pre	Post	Adjusted Change[1]	N	Pre	Post	Adjusted Change[1]	N
Peabody - Receptive Vocabulary (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 4 mo.	6 yr. 11 mo.	0 mo.	62	7 yr. 1 mo.	8 yr. 6 mo.	9 mo.*	57	8 yr. 8 mo.	9 yr. 5 mo.	2 mo.	10
Neale B - Listening Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	7 yr. 7 mo.	8 yr. 5 mo.	3 mo.*	62	8 yr. 3 mo.	9 yr. 2 mo.	3 mo.	57	8 yr. 5 mo.	9 yr. 5 mo.	4 mo.	10
Neale A - Oral Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 3 mo.	6 yr. 10 mo.	2 mo.	26	6 yr. 9 mo.	7 yr. 11 mo.	6 mo.*	55	7 yr. 5 mo.	8 yr. 5 mo.	5 mo.*	9
Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 4 mo.	6 yr. 5 mo.	6 mo.*	29	5 yr. 11 mo.	7 yr. 5 mo.	11 mo.*	55	7 yr. 2 mo.	8 yr. 2 mo.	5 mo.*	9
Neale A - Word Attack In Context (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 2 mo.	7 yr. 1 mo.	5 mo.*	29	6 yr. 10 mo.	8 yr. 1 mo.	7 mo.*	55	7 yr. 8 mo.	8 yr. 5 mo.	2 mo.	9
Schonell Spelling (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 3 mo.	6 yr. 5 mo.	7 mo.*	29	6 yr.	7 yr. 4 mo.	9 mo.*	55	7 yr. 2 mo.	8 yr. 5 mo.	8 mo.*	9
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Syllables (Mental Age Score)	4 yr. 10 mo.	5 yr. 6 mo.	1 mo.	60	5 yr. 9 mo.	6 yr. 8 mo.	3 mo.	57	6 yr. 11 mo.	8 yr. 1 mo.	6 mo.*	10
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Words (Mental Age Score)	4 yr. 7 mo.	6 yr. 2 mo.	11 mo.*	62	5 yr. 10 mo.	6 yr. 10 mo.	4 mo.	57	6 yr. 8 mo.	8 yr. 2 mo.	11 mo.	10
Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 7 mo.	7 yr. 10 mo.	1 yr. 7 mo.*	60	8 yr. 3 mo.	9 yr. 8 mo.	9 mo.*	56	8 yr. 3 mo.	9 yr. 9 mo.	11 mo.	10
Botel - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Subtests)	9	68	59*	62	44	81	37*	57	58	69	11*	10
Roswell-Chall - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Subtests)	11	74	63*	62	48	89	41*	57	80	96	16*	10
Betts - Sight Vocabulary (Reader Level achieved by at least 50% of all students)[2]	Below Pre-Primer	Primer	2 reader levels	62	Pre Primer	1st Reader	2 reader levels	57	1st Reader	3rd Reader	2 reader levels	10

[1] Change scores were adjusted for chronological age change from pre to posttest except for the Botel, Roswell-Chall and Betts.

[2] Betts Reader levels in order of difficulty are: Pre Primer, Primer and 1st Reader to 6th Reader. It is expected that children will have mastered the 1st reader by the end of Grade 1, the 2nd reader by the end of Grade 2, and so on.

TABLE 9a

MEAN PRE, POST, AND ADJUSTED CHANGE[1] SCORES FOR DIAGNOSTIC READING TESTS (ALL GRADES COMBINED)

Tests	Grades 1, 2 & 3 Combined			
	Pre	Post	Adjusted Change[1]	N
Peabody - Receptive Vocabulary (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 11 mo.	7 yr. 3 mo.	4 mo.*	129
Neale B - Listening Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	8 yr.	8 yr. 3 mo.	3 mo.*	129
Neale A - Oral Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 8 mo.	7 yr. 1 mo.	5 mo.*	90
Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 11 mo.	6 yr. 8 mo.	9 mo.*	94
Neale A - Word Attack in Context (Mental Age Score)	6 yr. 8 mo.	7 yr. 2 mo.	6 mo.*	93
Schonell Spelling (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 11 mo.	6 yr. 7 mo.	8 mo.*	93
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Syllables (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 5 mo.	5 yr. 7 mo.	2 mo.*	127
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Words (Mental Age Score)	5 yr. 4 mo.	6 yr.	8 mo.*	129
Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects (Mental Age Score)	7 yr.	8 yr. 2 mo.	14 mo.*	126
Botel - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Subtests)	28	74	46*	129
Roswell-Chall - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Subtests)	33	82	49*	129
Betts - Sight Vocabulary (Reader Level achieved by at least 50% of all students)[2]	Below Pre Primer	1st Reader	3 Reader Levels	129

[1]Change scores were adjusted for chronological age change from pre to posttest except for the Botel, Roswell-Chall and Betts.

[2]Betts Reader levels in order of difficulty are: Pre Primer, Primer and 1st Reader to 6th Reader. It is expected that children will have mastered the 1st reader by the end of Grade 1, the 2nd reader by the end of Grade 2, and so on.

* $p<.05$

TABLE 10

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES FOR GRADE 1 STUDENTS IN THEIR FIRST YEAR IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM, MEAN PRETEST SCORES FOR GRADE 2 STUDENTS IN THEIR FIRST YEAR IN THE PROGRAM, AND DIFFERENCE SCORES FOR DIAGNOSTIC READING TESTS

Tests	Grade 1		Grade 2		Difference
	Posttest	N	Pretest	N	
Peabody - Receptive Vocabulary (Mental Age Score)	6 years 10 months	55	6 years 11 months	29	-1 month
Neale B - Listening Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	8 years 5 months	55	8 years	29	5 months
Neale A - Oral Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	7 years	54	6 years 10 months	27	2 months
Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation (Mental Age Score)	6 years 5 months	54	6 years	28	5 months*
Neale A - Word Attack in Context (Mental Age Score)	7 years 2 months	54	6 years 10 months	27	4 months*
Schonell Spelling (Mental Age Score)	6 years 6 months	52	6 years 1 month	27	5 months*
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Syllables (Mental Age Score)	5 years 7 months	55	5 years 9 months	29	-2 months
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Words (Mental Age Score)	6 years 2 months	55	5 years 8 months	29	6 months
Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects (Mental Age Score)	7 years 10 months	54	8 years	29	-2months
Botel - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Sub-tests)	67	55	40	29	27*
Roswell-Chall - Phonics (Mean % Combining All Sub-tests)	73	55	40	29	32*

* $p < .05$

TABLE 11

MEAN CHRONOLOGICAL AGE, AND MEAN MENTAL AGE SCORES AT POSTTEST FOR GRADE TWO STUDENTS IN THEIR SECOND YEAR IN THE PROGRAM

	N	Mean Chronological Age At Posttest	Mean Mental Age Score At Posttest	Difference
Peabody - Receptive Vocabulary (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	8 years 10 months	10 months*
Neale B - Listening Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	9 years 3 months	15 months*
Neale A - Oral Comprehension (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	7 years 11 months	-1 month
Schonell A - Word Attack in Isolation (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	7 years 7 months	5 months
Neale A - Word Attack in Context (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	8 years 1 month	1 month
Schonell Spelling (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	7 years 6 months	-6 months*
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Syllables (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	6 years 4 months	-20 months*
Detroit - Auditory Memory for Words (Mental Age Score)	28	8 years	6 years 7 months	-17 months*
Detroit - Visual Memory for Objects (Mental Age Score)	27	8 years	9 years 9 months	21 months*

*$p < .05$

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE (N=7)[1]

TABLE 12

ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM ADEQUATE?

Yes	7
No	0

TABLE 13

ARE THE SELECTION CRITERIA ADEQUATE?

Yes	7
No	0

TABLE 14

WHAT WORK LOAD IS REALISTIC FOR THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER?

Compensatory classes full time	5
Compensatory classes part time	2
Compensatory classes plus one or two others	0

TABLE 15

WHAT IS THE MAXIMUM STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO THAT WOULD BE EFFECTIVE IN THE COMPENSATORY CLASS(ES) IN YOUR SCHOOL?

Mean number of students per class - Grade I - 6	
Mean number of students per class - Grade II - 6	

TABLE 16

IS THE 70 MINUTE PERIOD ALLOTTED FOR THE COMPENSATORY CLASS(ES) PER MORNING AN ADEQUATE PERIOD OF TIME FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPENSATORY CLASS(ES)?

Yes	6
No	0

[1]The number of responses does not always add up to 7 for each question due to missing data, i.e., question not answered.

TABLE 17

UNDER EXISTING CONDITIONS IN YOUR SCHOOL, IS IT POSSIBLE TO SCHEDULE MORE REGULAR CLASSROOM TIME FOR LANGUAGE ARTS TO PERMIT MORE TIME FOR THE COMPENSATORY CLASS(ES)?

Yes	3
No	2

TABLE 18

DOES THIS PROGRAM REQUIRE SPECIAL TEACHING SKILLS THAT MAY NOT BE REQUIRED IN A REGULAR CLASSROOM SITUATION?

Yes	4
No	3

TABLE 19

HAS THE INITIATION OF THIS PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL INCREASED YOUR ADMINISTRATIVE WORK LOAD?

Yes, very much	0
Yes	4
Not at all	3

TABLE 20

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU CONSIDER THE TIME YOU PERSONALLY HAVE SPENT SCHEDULING THE COMPENSATORY CLASSES, ATTENDING MEETINGS AND INSERVICES TO HAVE BEEN WELL SPENT IN TERMS OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

A waste of time	0
-	0
-	1
-	2
Very well spent	4

TABLE 21

HAVE THE RESOURCES ALLOCATED FOR THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM BEEN ADEQUATE FOR THE PROPER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL?

Yes	7
No	0

TABLE 22

IN TERMS OF THE EXPECTED BENEFITS FROM THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM, DO YOU CONSIDER THE EXPENDITURE OF THE ALLOCATION FOR THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL TO BE

Very well spent	5
-	1
-	1
-	0
A waste of money	0

TABLE 23

ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM TEACHER(S) AND THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

Yes	7
No	0

TABLE 24

WAS THE COMMUNICATION BENEFICIAL TO THOSE INVOLVED?

Yes	7
No	0

TABLE 25

DO YOU THINK THAT THE METHODS AND MATERIALS USED IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM HAVE INFLUENCED THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

Yes, a great deal	3
Yes, to some extent	4
No, not at all	0

TABLE 26

DO YOU SEE ANY ADVANTAGES FOR THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER IN YOUR SCHOOL AS A RESULT OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes	6
No	0

TABLE 27

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PRESENT INTERACTION BETWEEN THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER(S) AND THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

Adequate	7
Inadequate	0

TABLE 28

WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THE CONTINUATION OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes, definitely	7
Yes, with some modifications	0
Yes, with major modifications	0
No, would not recommend continuation	0

COMPENSATORY TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (N=9)[1]

TABLE 29

HAVE YOU TAKEN UNIVERSITY LEVEL COURSES THAT DEALT WITH ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Special Education	3
Reading Curriculum and Instruction	6
Language Curriculum and Instruction	5
Speech Development	2
None of the above	2

TABLE 30

WHAT WORK LOAD WOULD YOU CONSIDER REALISTIC FOR THE COMPENSATORY TEACHERS?

Compensatory classes, part-time	2
Compensatory classes, full-time	3
Compensatory classes plus one or two others	1
Full teaching load	2

TABLE 31

IS THE 70 MINUTES PER MORNING AN ADEQUATE PERIOD OF TIME FOR STUDENTS IN THE COMPENSATORY CLASSES?

Yes	3
No	6

TABLE 32

IF 70 MINUTES IS NOT ADEQUATE WHAT AMOUNT OF TIME IS REQUIRED PER DAY?

Mean Number of Minutes Per Day	112

TABLE 33

HOW MANY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD IN INNER-CITY SCHOOLS?

Mean Number of Years	3.9

[1]The number of responses does not always add up to 9 for each question, due to missing data, i.e., question not answered.

TABLE 34

ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT PER WEEK IN PREPARATION FOR YOUR COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING PROGRAM CLASSES

Mean Number of Hours Per Week	7.8

TABLE 35

WHAT IS THE MAXIMUM STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO THAT WOULD BE EFFECTIVE IN YOUR COMPENSATORY CLASS(ES)?

Mean Number of Students Per Class	7

TABLE 36

WERE THE STUDENTS IN YOUR CLASS(ES) SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF PARTICULAR CRITERIA?

Yes	9
No	0

TABLE 37

DO YOU HAVE ANY STUDENTS IN YOUR CLASS(ES) WHO DO NOT BELONG IN THE PROGRAM?

Yes	3
No	6

TABLE 38

DID YOU USE THE RESULTS OF THE PRETEST GIVEN TO DEVISE INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS?

Yes	4
No	0
Partially	5

TABLE 39

DID YOU PREPARE A LIST OF OBJECTIVES FOR EACH STUDENT BASED ON THEIR PRETEST PERFORMANCE?

Yes	2
No	2
Partially	5

TABLE 40

EVALUATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH TEST HELPED YOU TO PREPARE INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAMS FOR YOUR STUDENTS

GRADE 1

Tests	Very Little	A Little	Some	Greatly	Not At All
WISC	5	1	1	-	-
Detroit - Syllables	1	2	5	1	-
Words	1	1	4	2	1
Visual Memory	1	1	4	2	1
Neale B	1	-	6	1	-
Roswell Chall	-	-	1	3	5
Metropolitan Readiness Test	1	2	2	3	-

GRADE 2

Tests	Very Little	A Little	Some	Greatly	Not At All
WISC	2	1	1	-	-
Detroit - Syllables	1	3	2	1	-
Words	1	2	2	3	-
Visual Memory	1	2	2	3	-
Neale A - Word Attack	-	-	4	4	-
Oral Reading Comp.	-	-	3	4	-
Schonell A Spelling	-	1	3	4	-
Word Attack	-	-	4	4	-
Neale B	1	1	5	1	-
Betts	-	-	2	5	1
Botel	-	-	2	4	1
Roswell Chall	-	-	1	4	3
EPSB Math	5	-	-	-	-

TABLE 41

DO YOU THINK THAT THE COMBINED USE OF PRETESTS AND INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAMS IS AN EFFECTIVE APPROACH TO THE LANGUAGE DIFFICULTIES EXHIBITED BY YOUR STUDENTS?

Yes	8
No	0
Undecided	1

TABLE 42

ENROLMENT DATA

	Sex	Grade 1	Grade 2	Total
Number who have been in the compensatory program in your school this year	Boys	50	40	90
	Girls	32	24	56
Number who have transferred out of the compensatory program this year	Boys	14	6	20
	Girls	14	3	17
Number who have been withdrawn from the compensatory program for other reasons	Boys	0	0	0
	Girls	0	1	1

TABLE 43

COMPENSATORY TEACHERS RECOMMENDATIONS RE: PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS NEXT YEAR

	Sex	Grade 1	Grade 2	Total
Return to regular class programs next grade and continue in compensatory class	Boys	20	1	21
	Girls	9	0	9
Return to regular class programs, repeat grade and continue in compensatory class	Boys	6	3	9
	Girls	3	1	4
Return to regular class programs, next grade, and <u>not</u> continue in compensatory	Boys	9	21	30
	Girls	17	18	25
Return to regular class programs, repeat grade, and <u>not</u> continue in compensatory	Boys	3	4	7
	Girls	2	2	4
Be placed in special class	Boys	1	4	5
	Girls	-	-	-

TABLE 44

HOW MANY OF THE FORMAL INSERVICES DID YOU ATTEND?

All	7
Two	2

TABLE 45

TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE INSERVICES HELP YOU AS A TEACHER IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Not Helpful	0
-	0
-	1
-	3
Very Helpful	5

TABLE 46

TO WHAT EXTENT DID INTERCOOPERATION AMONG THE TEACHERS IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM EXIST?

A Great Deal	0
-	5
-	2
-	2
None	0

TABLE 47

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE INTERCOOPERATION?

Very Useful	5
Useful	3
Not very useful	1
A waste of time	0

TABLE 48

DO YOU THINK THAT THIS PROGRAM MEETS THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE LOW LANGUAGE ARTS/READING SKILLS?

Better than other language arts oriented programs that are already in existence in the EPSB Elementary Schools	6
As well as other language arts oriented programs that are already in existence in EPSB Elementary Schools.	2
Not as well as other language arts oriented programs already in existence in EPSB Elementary Schools.	0

TABLE 49

DOES THE EXTRA ATTENTION GIVEN TO LANGUAGE ARTS MAKE AN ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDENT'S ACHIEVEMENT IN THIS AREA?

Yes, definitely	5
Yes, probably	4
Probably not	0
Definitely not	0

TABLE 50

DOES THIS PROGRAM REQUIRE SPECIAL TEACHING SKILLS THAT MAY NOT BE REQUIRED IN A REGULAR CLASSROOM SITUATION?

Yes	2
No	6

TABLE 51

HAVE YOU NOTICED A CHANGE IN YOUR TEACHING APPROACHE(ES) THIS YEAR AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEARS?

Yes	7
No	2

TABLE 52

DO YOU THINK THAT THE CURRICULUM IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM IS DIFFERENT FROM THE CURRICULUM IN THE REGULAR LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM?

The same	1
Slightly different	4
Very different	4

TABLE 53

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE RELATIVE SUCCESS OF THE OVERALL PROGRAM THUS FAR?

Very successful	8
Somewhat successful	1
Somewhat unsuccessful	0
Very unsuccessful	0

TABLE 54

DO YOU WISH TO CONTINUE IN THE PROGRAM NEXT YEAR?

Yes	8
No	1

TABLE 55

HOW WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED THE PROGRAM TO HAVE BEEN PRESENTED TO YOU?

More structured than presently	1
Just as it is	7
Less structured than presently	0

TABLE 56

HOW MANY CLASSROOM TEACHERS IN YOUR SCHOOL HAD CHILDREN IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM THIS YEAR?

Mean Number of Teachers	2.9

TABLE 57

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU HAD TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

Very adequate	3
Just adequate	5
Inadequate	1

TABLE 58

HOW USEFUL WAS YOUR COMMUNICATION WITH THE REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS CONCERNING THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Very useful	2
Generally useful	5
Mixed feelings about usefulness	2
Not very useful	0
Not at all useful	0

TABLE 59

DID YOU USE SUB-TIME FOR FORMAL MEETINGS WITH YOUR CLASSROOM TEACHERS?

Yes	6
No	3

TABLE 60

HOW USEFUL DID YOU FIND THESE FORMAL MEETINGS?

Extremely Useful	4
-	2
-	0
-	0
Not At All Useful	0

TABLE 61

WOULD YOU USE SUB-TIME FOR FORMAL CONFERENCES IN THE FUTURE?

Yes	9
No	0

TABLE 62

DO YOU THINK THAT THE METHODS AND MATERIALS YOU USE IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM HAVE INFLUENCED THE OTHER TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL?

To a great extent	3
To some extent	5
Not at all	1
Do not know	1

TABLE 63

WOULD YOU RECOMMEND CONTINUATION OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes, definitely	8
Yes, with some modification	1
Yes, but with major modification	0
No, would not recommend continuation	0

TABLE 64

DOES THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL OFFER ADVANTAGES TO THE COMPENSATORY STUDENTS' REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHERS?
(E.G., REDUCING CLASS SIZE, ETC.)

Yes	9
No	0

CLASSROOM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (N=23)[1]

TABLE 65

DO YOU THINK THAT YOU HAD ADEQUATE TIME TO COMMUNICATE WITH THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER ABOUT THE PROGRAM?

Yes, very adequate	11
Yes, adequate	11
No, inadequate	1

TABLE 66

HAVE YOU HAD FORMAL CONFERENCES WITH THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER USING SUB-TIME?

Yes	12
No	11

TABLE 67

HOW USEFUL DID YOU FIND THESE FORMAL MEETINGS?

Extremely Useful	8
-	3
-	0
-	1
Not At All Useful	0

TABLE 68

HOW USEFUL WAS YOUR COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER CONCERNING THE PROGRAM?

Very Useful	13
Generally Useful	9
Mixed Feelings About Usefulness	0
Not Very Useful	1
Not At All Useful	0

[1]The number of responses does not always add up to 23 for each question due to missing data, i.e., question not answered.

TABLE 69

TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU THINK THAT THE METHODS AND MATERIALS USED IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM HAVE INFLUENCED YOUR CLASSROOM TEACHING?

To a great extent	3
To some extent	14
Not at all	4
Don't know	2

TABLE 70

HAVE THERE BEEN ANY ADVANTAGES TO YOU AS A CLASSROOM TEACHER AS A RESULT OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes	22
No	1

TABLE 71

THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM FOCUSES ON THE STUDENTS' LANGUAGE ARTS/READING SKILLS. HAVE YOU OBSERVED A CHANGE IN THE COMPENSATORY STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN THE SUBJECT AREAS THAT YOU TEACH?

Yes	21
No	1

TABLE 72

IF YOU HAVE OBSERVED A CHANGE IN THE COMPENSATORY STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN THE SUBJECT AREAS YOU TEACH, TO WHAT EXTENT WAS THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM INVOLVED?

A great deal	7
-	9
-	4
-	1
Not at all	0

TABLE 73

WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THE CONTINUATION OF THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes, definitely	18
Yes, with some modifications	5
Yes, but with major modifications	0
No, would not recommend continuation	0

TABLE 74

HOW MANY STUDENTS FROM YOUR CLASS HAVE BEEN IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Mean Number of Students	5

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 75

DID YOU KNOW THAT YOUR CHILD WAS IN THIS SPECIAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAM?

Yes	53 (95%)
No	3 (5%)

TABLE 76

WHO TOLD YOU THAT YOUR CHILD WAS IN THIS PROGRAM?

Classroom Teacher	17 (30%)*
Compensatory Teacher	17 (30%)
Your Child	8 (14%)

TABLE 77

HAVE YOU EVER TALKED TO THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER ON THE PHONE?

Yes	32 (57%)
No	21 (38%)

TABLE 78

HAVE YOU EVER TALKED WITH THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER AT A PARENT-TEACHER MEETING?

Yes	35 (63%)
No	18 (32%)

TABLE 79

HAVE YOU EVER RECEIVED A LETTER FROM THE COMPENSATORY TEACHER?

Yes	29 (52%)
No	25 (45%)

* Percentages do not always add up to 100, due to missing data, i.e., question not answered.

TABLE 80

DOES YOUR CHILD READ TO YOU AT HOME?

Yes	52 (93%)
No	3 (5%)

TABLE 81

HOW OFTEN DOES YOUR CHILD READ TO YOU AT HOME?

Every day	12 (21%)
Twice a week	26 (46%)
Once a week	8 (14%)
Once every two weeks	5 (9%)
Once a month	2 (4%)

TABLE 82

HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CHILD'S READING?

Very Good	11 (20%)
Good	25 (44%)
Average	14 (25%)
Below Average	5 (9%)
Poor	1 (2%)

TABLE 83

HOW MUCH HAS THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM HELPED YOUR CHILD'S READING?

Very Much	47 (84%)
A Little	7 (12%)
Not At All	0
Don't Know	1 (2%)

TABLE 84

HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR CHILD'S ABILITY TO TALK ABOUT HIS THOUGHTS AND IDEAS?

Has improved very much	28 (50%)
Has improved a little	19 (34%)
Has not changed	5 (9%)
Has become a little worse	0
Has become much worse	0
Don't Know	2 (4%)

TABLE 85

HAS THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM HELPED YOUR CHILD'S ABILITY TO TALK ABOUT HIS THOUGHTS AND IDEAS?

Very Much	27 (48%)
A little	20 (36%)
Not at all	3 (5%)
Don't know	4 (7%)

TABLE 86

HOW DOES YOUR CHILD FEEL ABOUT SCHOOL?

Likes school	50 (89%)
Does not like school	3 (5%)
Don't know	1 (2%)

TABLE 87

HOW DOES YOUR CHILD FEEL ABOUT READING?

Likes to read very much	33 (59%)
Likes to read a little	18 (32%)
Does not like to read	3 (5%)
Don't know	1 (2%)

TABLE 88

WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR CHILD TO CONTINUE IN THE COMPENSATORY PROGRAM NEXT YEAR IF THE TEACHER FEELS THAT THIS WOULD BE BEST?

Yes	53 (95%)
No	1 (2%)
Don't Know	1 (2%)